

# REMARKS

## I. The Examiner's Interview

An Examiner's interview was held on January 22, 2007 at the U.S. Patent Office.

The changes that were made in claims 1 to 11 in the amendment filed November 17, 2006 to overcome the indefiniteness rejection of the claims were discussed with the Examiner. During the discussions it became apparent that the current claims 1 to 11 were still indefinite despite the changes made in the amendment filed November 17, 2006.

This supplemental amendment has been prepared to file new claims 27 to 38, which hopefully comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraph. The previously filed indefinite claims 1 to 11 and claims 23 to 26 have been canceled.

It is respectfully submitted that new claims 27 to 38 contain definite wording that particularly points out and distinctly claims the applicants' invention and are fully supported by the disclosures in applicants' specification.

## II. The Claim Changes

New claims 27 to 38 include four separate new sets of claims.

The first set of claims, namely claims 27 to 29, includes independent claim 27, which claims a first embodiment of applicants' method for precision pressing of a glass body to form an optical component, as a series of steps of performing certain acts. Independent claim 27 is drafted with restrictive "consisting of"

wording and the claimed method is limited to the recited steps. Claim 27 claims the preferred embodiment of the method shown in figure 1 and described on page 8, line 17, to page 9, line 22 of the applicants' originally filed specification. The wording of claim 27, steps c) to i), corresponds to and is fully supported by the wording on page 8, line 22, to page 9, line 22 of the applicants' specification. Steps a) and b) of claim 27 are based on the disclosure, e.g. on page 11, lines 18 to 20, and page 3, lines 16 to 17, of applicants' specification.

Dependent claims 28 and 29 claim the form of the voltage applied to the glass body during the heating of claim 27 without using the term "unsymmetrical or asymmetric A.C. voltage", which was used in the original claims. Basis for the new claims appears on page 12, lines 11 and 12, and page 6, lines 4 to 5, of applicants' specification.

Claims 30 to 32 are the second set of claims. Independent claim 30 also uses restrictive "consisting of" wording and claims the preferred embodiments of the method shown in figures 2 and 3 and described on pages 10 and 11 of the applicants' originally filed specification. The wording of claim 30, steps c) to j), corresponds to and is fully supported by the wording on page 10, line 2, to page 11, line 15 of the applicants' specification. Steps a) and b) of claim 30 are based on the disclosure, e.g. on page 11, lines 18 to 20, and page 3, lines 16 to 17, of applicants' specification

Dependent claims 31 and 32 claim the subject matter of claims 28 and 29, and the basis in the specification is the same.

Independent method claim 33 is a broader claim than claim 27, which

claims the embodiment of figure 1. Independent method claim 33 uses open-ended “comprising” wording and includes steps a) to e) of claim 27.

Independent claim 36 is broader than claim 30, which claims the embodiments of figures 2 and 3. Independent method claim 36 uses open-ended “comprising” wording and includes steps a) to f) of claim 30.

Dependent claims 34 and 37 claim the second stage pressure and temperature reduction of the preferred embodiments shown in the drawing.

Dependent claims 35 and 38 claim an applied voltage comprising a D.C. voltage.

### **III. Relation of the New Claims to Ribes, et al**

It is respectfully submitted that none of the new claims 27 to 38 should be rejected as anticipated by or obvious over Ribes, et al, U.S. Patent 6,279,346. .

Ribes, et al, does disclose a method for reducing hot sticking of a glass body during molding the glass body by polarizing the glass body with a D.C. or an A.C. voltage applied across the glass body (column 2, lines 13 to 21, and column 3, lines 50 to 62, and example 3).

However Ribes, et al, do not disclose producing an optical component with surface dimension fluctuations of no more than 100 nm by molding a glass body with a special molding method including special heating and pressing stages as claimed in claims 27 to 38, especially independent claims 27 and 30.

Ribes, et al, do not disclose the particular steps of independent claims 27, 30, 33 and 36, which were required to obtain the optical component with the

good quality with dimension fluctuations of no more than 100 nm.

For example, Ribes, et al, does not teach applying a maximum pressure when the glass body and mold reach a common temperature during heating and then maintaining the maximum pressure and the mold temperature constant during a first press stage. Ribes, et al, do not teach simultaneously reducing the pressure and temperature during a second press stage following the first press stage.

It is well established that each and every limitation of a claimed invention must be disclosed in a single prior art reference in order to be able to reject the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) based on the disclosures in the single prior art reference. See M.P.E.P. 2131 and also the opinion in *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q. 2nd 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicants claim a method of precision pressing a glass body to obtain a precisely shaped optical component, such as a lens, with dimension variations of no more than 100 nm. The applicants' method is improved in relation to the prior art because it can be performed more rapidly because the application of the voltage allows the glass to be brought to a higher temperature in the mold so that it has a lower viscosity and is more easily pressed accurately. Because the process is more rapid throughput can be increased and/or manufacturing costs reduced.

For the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted that new claims 27 to 38 should **not** be rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102 by or obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Ribes, et al.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawing be further amended or corrected in formal respects to put this case in condition for final allowance, then it is requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment and the case passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing the case to allowance, he or she is invited to telephone the undersigned at 1-631-549 4700.

In view of the foregoing, favorable allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**/ Michael J. Striker /**

Michael J. Striker,  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Reg. No. 27,233